

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records



**1395th
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 15 December 1965,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 35:

Reports of the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East
Report of the Special Political Committee. .

Agenda item 36:

The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa:

(a) Reports of the Special Committee on the Policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa;

(b) Reports of the Secretary-General
Report of the Special Political Committee. .

Agenda item 101:

Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects:

(a) Reports of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations;

(b) The authorization and financing of future peace-keeping operations
Report of the Special Political Committee. .

Page

1

President: Mr. Amintore FANFANI (Italy).

AGENDA ITEM 35

Reports of the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE
(A/6115 AND CORR.1)

AGENDA ITEM 36

The policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa:

(a) Reports of the Special Committee on the Policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa;

(b) Reports of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE
(A/6159)

AGENDA ITEM 101

Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects:

(a) Report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations;

(b) The authorization and financing of future peace-keeping operations

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE
(A/6158)

Mr. Lannung (Denmark), Rapporteur of the Special Political Committee, presented the reports of that Committee and then spoke as follows.

1. Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark), Rapporteur of the Special Committee: As Rapporteur of the Special Political Committee, it is my duty to present to the General Assembly this morning for its consideration the reports of the Special Political Committee relating to items 35, 101 and 36 of the agenda of the twentieth session of the Assembly.

2. The first report to be taken up this morning concerns agenda item 35 [A/6115 and Corr.1]. At this session, the Special Political Committee devoted twenty-seven meetings to the discussion of the Palestine refugee question, which continues to be highly important and controversial. More than forty statements were made during the general debate. Numerous other statements were made in exercise of the right of reply, as well as on the various proposals submitted to the Committee. Those proposals included two draft resolutions, one submitted by the United States and the other by Afghanistan and Malaysia; and two sets of amendments to the United States draft resolution, one set introduced by Pakistan and Somalia and the other by Israel. The Israel amendments were not put to the vote, and the draft resolution submitted by Afghanistan and Malaysia failed of adoption in the Committee. Apart from one amendment that was withdrawn by its sponsors, the Pakistan-Somalia amendments were approved. The United States draft resolution thus modified was approved by the Committee, and is to be found in paragraph 16 of the report.

3. The second report of the Special Political Committee which the Assembly is to take up this morning relates to agenda item 101 [A/6158]. The Committee devoted a total of seventeen meetings to the discussion of this item, and statements were made in the general debate by some sixty-eight delegations. Several proposals were submitted to the Committee. The first draft resolution recommended by the Special Political Committee was sponsored by nineteen delegations and was approved on 10 December 1965.

4. Following on the proposals suggested in the Irish communications in August and September in connexion with sub-item (b), entitled "The authorization and financing of future peace-keeping operations", a joint draft was submitted on 17 November by Ireland and seven other delegations. This text was later

replaced by a second draft resolution, which was subsequently revised on 10 December [A/6158, para. 6] and which is referred to in the second draft resolution recommended by the Special Political Committee.

5. Lastly, I have the honour to submit the Special Political Committee's report on item 36 [A/6159]. The Committee devoted fourteen of its meetings to the consideration of this question, in which the representative of South Africa did not participate. The Committee's thorough consideration of the item is borne out by the fact that sixty-six delegations participated in the general debate, and every one of them condemned the racial policies pursued by the Government of the Republic of South Africa. At the conclusion of its debate the Committee adopted two draft resolutions, the texts of which are to be found in paragraph 17 of its report.

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Special Political Committee.

6. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): In accordance with the decision which the General Assembly has just taken, statements will be limited to explanations of vote.

7. The Assembly will now consider agenda item 35, on which the Special Political Committee has submitted a draft resolution [A/6115, para. 16]. In addition, the delegation of Nigeria has submitted a draft resolution [A/L.474].

8. If no delegation wishes to speak, we shall proceed to the vote. Normally, the General Assembly takes a decision first on the recommendations of the Main Committees. The delegation of Nigeria, however, has requested that priority should be given to its draft resolution. I shall therefore consult the Assembly on this point. Is there any objection to voting first on the Nigerian draft resolution? If there is no objection, I shall consider that the General Assembly has agreed that this text should be voted on first.

It was so decided.

9. Mr. ADEBO (Nigeria): I have asked for the floor in order formally to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/L.474. I apologize to the Assembly for presenting such a draft at this stage of the proceedings on the question before us. I am venturing to do so only because my delegation believes that this draft represents the broadest possible basis of agreement between the parties directly concerned for the renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency.

10. The draft resolution has been prepared in the light of the very extensive discussions and debates that took place in the Special Political Committee and it was in fact drafted after very wide consultations vis-à-vis the positions expressed on the subject in the Special Committee and afterwards. In its present form it is, I hope, self-explanatory, and accordingly it requires little or no clarification from me. Therefore I shall comment only on two aspects and I shall do so very briefly.

11. In the first place, operative paragraph 6 of the draft directs the Commissioner-General of the United

Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Arab Refugees

"to take such measures, including rectification of the relief rolls, a problem which has been and continues to be of major concern to the General Assembly, to assure, in co-operation with the Governments concerned, the most equitable distribution of relief based on need".

We believe that the wording of this paragraph would give the Commissioner-General the necessary latitude to carry on with rectification of the relief rolls on an appropriate basis with the co-operation of the host Governments.

12. My second comment refers to operative paragraphs 1, 7 and 8, in which due and full account of the status of the refugees themselves as set forth in the previous resolutions of the General Assembly and in the latest report of the Commissioner-General of UNWRA has been taken.

13. It is the hope of my delegation that the General Assembly, having been kind enough to agree to give priority to this draft resolution, will now proceed to adopt it with the widest possible support.

14. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I shall put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by Nigeria [A/L.474]. A roll-call vote has been requested.

The vote was taken by roll-call.

The United States of America, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Burma, Burundi, Laos, Madagascar, Portugal, Sierra Leone, South Africa.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 91 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions.**

15. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Since the Nigerian draft resolution has been adopted, I do not think it is necessary for the Assembly to take

*The representatives of Kuwait (see para. 85) and Colombia subsequently informed the Secretariat that, if they had been present during the vote, they would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

a decision on the draft resolution submitted by the Special Political Committee. If there is no objection, I shall consider that the Assembly agrees to this procedure.

It was so decided.

16. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): My delegation would like to make a short statement explaining our vote on the resolution which has just been adopted by the Assembly.

17. The new resolution was drafted after wide and extensive consultations and hard work. Its terms are clear; its contents are self-explanatory, and it leaves no room for doubt.

18. In operative paragraph 6 of the resolution, reference is made to the need for rectification. The same paragraph stresses the importance of achieving the most equitable distribution of relief based on need. The representative of Nigeria, the sponsor of the new resolution, stated very ably and clearly that it was the intention and the desire to leave to the Commissioner-General the necessary latitude to move ahead on rectification on any appropriate basis, with the co-operation of the host Governments. Of course, the need and the equitable distribution mentioned in operative paragraph 6 apply to all refugees without exception — all categories of refugees are included. Therefore, there is no necessity to emphasize the need of the third generation refugees. The report of the Commissioner-General [A/6013] and his statement in the Special Political Committee on this issue [432nd meeting] are quite clear, as is also the stand of the host Governments. We are certain that the Commissioner-General who, by virtue of this resolution, is given the right to take all steps necessary to achieve the most equitable distribution; will exercise this right equitably and justly.

19. We must state here and now that assistance and relief to the third generation refugees is a must, as has been stated and reiterated by the Commissioner-General in paragraph 25 of his report and also in his statement. The Commissioner-General clearly stated that it would be inhuman to deny health services, educational services and rations to third generation refugees. The nine-point proposal presented by the host Governments reflects most explicitly the general lines of agreement on the question of rectification, equitable distribution and eligibility of needy refugees for receiving rations.

20. My Government, being one of the host countries, will co-operate in all of this in order to render the greatest possible service to those who are in real need for such assistance and relief, who are even below subsistence level. The application of this formula will be made, of course, in close consultation and co-operation with the host Governments, which have already stated their views very clearly on this subject.

21. It is on the basis of this understanding of the resolution that my Government will co-operate fully with the Commissioner-General. Needless to say, the equitable distribution of rations to all refugees, without exception, on the basis of need, calls for complete and full co-operation.

22. I turn now to another important clause embodied in the new resolution. I am referring to operative paragraphs 1, 7 and 8 of the resolution. These paragraphs emphasize the legitimate rights of the people of Palestine, as embodied in the United Nations resolutions which are endorsed by the United Nations every year. The new resolution makes it clear that, in discussing the question of UNRWA, the United Nations is merely dealing with a by-product of the Palestine problem. The existence of the Palestine problem will surely always remain a subject for our deliberations and discussions until the legitimate rights of the people of Palestine are restored and until the tragedy which befell the Arab people of Palestine comes to an end.

23. Those paragraphs stress the rights of the Arabs of Palestine to repatriation or compensation, as called for in paragraph 11 of resolution 194 (III). The present resolution expresses regret that no progress has been achieved on this aspect of the problem, and calls upon the Palestine Conciliation Commission to intensify its efforts for the implementation of paragraph 11 of the aforementioned resolution, which expressly states that the refugees wishing to return to their homes should be permitted to do so at the earliest practical date.

24. The Assembly, in the present resolution, expresses regret that repatriation or compensation has not been effected. This expression of the Assembly is motivated by the fact that seventeen years have passed, and no progress on this basic issue has been achieved because of Israel's constant, deliberate refusal and continued defiance of the United Nations resolutions.

25. We are glad that the new resolution reflects all these points with proper and adequate emphasis on paragraph 11 of resolution 194 (III). We shall like to thank the representative of Nigeria for his constructive efforts in this matter.

26. There is one final observation I should like to make. This is another resolution that has been adopted by this body on this subject. Israel, as we have seen, is the only country that voted against the present resolution — a single authority challenging the will of the United Nations. With the adoption of this new resolution, the question arises: will Israel put an end to its malicious behaviour vis-à-vis the United Nations stand? If the negative attitude of Israel continues, should the United Nations, the Arab States, and the Arab people of Palestine remain indifferent to this behaviour?

27. My delegation knows very well that the Arab people of Palestine today have more faith in their future, more faith in tomorrow. What is needed, however, is that they have more faith in the United Nations; and this poses a real challenge to all of us, and we should all ponder it.

28. Mr. LICHTVELD (Netherlands): My delegation has voted for the resolution just adopted by the Assembly in a spirit of compromise and for humanitarian reasons. In spite of the efforts which were made after completion of the debate in the Special Political Committee to render the resolution more widely acceptable, we still are not completely satisfied with

the present text. We would have preferred the original United States draft [see A/6115 and Corr.1, para. 7]. That draft contained a balanced text, the primary purpose of which was the continuation of the UNRWA. Although certain additions have been made that have somewhat upset the balance in the text, the primary aim has been assured by the resolution as it now stands and, therefore, we voted in favour of it.

29. Having done so, my delegation would like to make one remark with regard to operative paragraph 6 of the resolution. In casting its affirmative vote, my Government sincerely hopes that the host countries will extend their full co-operation to the Commissioner-General in all efforts to rectify the ration rolls. The Commissioner-General reported that only very limited results could be achieved in this field so far. We should like to encourage him to make a fresh approach to this contentious and persistent problem, but we realize that for its solution he needs the active and unconditional co-operation of the host countries.

30. My Government feels that, at least pending any solution of this matter, consideration of the extension of UNRWA assistance to new categories of beneficiaries would be inopportune and unrealistic. If no revision of the relief rolls is forthcoming, it will not be possible to make substantial savings, and any extension of the ration rolls would then be to the detriment of the present beneficiaries. We do think it would be possible, however, for UNRWA to make exceptions in individual cases where special consideration for humanitarian reasons would seem justified. The Commissioner-General's first task will be to take care of the refugees already on the rolls or of those who are presently eligible for inscription.

31. Mr. CABRERA MUÑOZ-LEDO (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): The Mexican delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/L.474 because it considers that the reasons for its abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/L.113 as amended in the Special Political Committee [A/6115 and Corr.1] have been largely eliminated. They are set forth in the summary record of the 459th meeting of the Committee.

32. Mr. HOPE (United Kingdom): My delegation was pleased to vote in favour of the draft resolution introduced by the representative of Nigeria this morning, which has now been adopted by such a large majority vote of the Members of this Assembly. We realize that the resolution will not have met the wishes of all those delegations that voted for it, and my delegation, for its part, would certainly have liked to see more specific emphasis placed on the need for there to be full co-operation between the host Governments of the Palestinian refugees and the Commissioner-General of UNRWA. My Government's position was made quite clear on this important point in a statement I made in the Special Political Committee on 10 November last [451st meeting], when the United Kingdom contribution to UNRWA for 1966 was announced. There can be no doubt that such co-operation is essential if the important task of rectifying the ration rolls so that they included only refugees genuinely in need is to be completed as quickly as possible.

33. It is my delegation's earnest hope that operative paragraph 6 of the resolution will nevertheless be interpreted as an expression of the General Assembly's wish that rectification of the rolls will henceforth be energetically pursued by both the host Governments and the Commissioner-General. In this connexion, my delegation welcomes the promise of co-operation made by the representative of Jordan today in his explanation of vote.

34. Finally, operative paragraph 8 of the resolution extends the mandate of the Agency for a further three years until 30 June 1969. My delegation welcomes the fact that the Commissioner-General has, by this extension, been given an adequate period of time in which to plan the future operations of the Agency. But, as his report to the General Assembly made painfully clear, Mr. Michelmores requires not only time for this purpose, but adequate financial support from the Members of this Assembly as well. The resolution draws attention to the critical financial situation of the Agency, and my delegation would like to stress the call which it makes to all Governments to contribute generously to UNRWA.

35. Mr. SCHUURMANS (Belgium) (translated from French): The Belgian delegation is glad to see that the spirit of conciliation has once again triumphed in this Hall. It gives credit for this to the delegations most directly concerned with the tragic fate of the Palestine refugees.

36. The resolution which we have just adopted is doubtless far from perfect. Belgium, for its part, would have liked to see this painful question settled once and for all. But we all know that in this matter there is no simple or speedy solution. The present resolution has at least the advantage of extending the term of office of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East. The Belgian delegation wishes once again to pay a tribute to the admirable work done by the Agency and its Commissioner-General. But the work of the Agency is only a palliative; the United Nations should spare no effort to achieve a genuine solution. The United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine has received a new mandate and we place great hopes in its activities.

37. We must put an end to the sufferings of the refugees. They are the pitiful victims of a tragedy which has overwhelmed them and our feelings of charity towards our fellow-men do not allow us to remain indifferent to their fate. We cannot resign ourselves to the idea of a whole people living indefinitely in camps.

38. Many United Nations resolutions have pointed the way towards the solution of this agonizing problem. Unfortunately, we realize that all these resolutions are not perfect either but they represent a sort of common denominator of the opinions generally held in our Organization and must therefore provide the basis for our work, the work of the Agency and that of the Conciliation Commission.

39. As I said a moment ago, we cannot allow the present misery of the refugee to go on for ever. The Belgian Government fervently hopes that these people, who have been so sorely tried, will be restored to

a normal way of life either by repatriation or by resettlement accompanied by equitable compensation for the losses they have suffered. To be sure, we do not conceal the difficulties and risks of such operations, but we are convinced that solutions can be found provided that the parties concerned show goodwill and especially if we never lose sight of the crux of the problem, namely, the lamentable fate of the refugees themselves which, after all, must not only be improved but radically changed. It was in this spirit that the Belgian delegation voted for the text which the General Assembly has just adopted.

40. Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (United States of America): Before explaining the vote of the United States and commenting on the resolution just adopted by the General Assembly, I wish to express my delegation's sincere appreciation to the delegation of Nigeria for its having taken the initiative in presenting the draft resolution.

41. In our view, the text just adopted is a happy outcome of the lengthy deliberations in the Special Political Committee. It is, in our estimation, a balanced statement of the Assembly's views and one which will successfully meet the humanitarian problems posed by the refugee situation by extending the mandate of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for a three-year period. This will give the Commissioner-General the necessary time to administer an effective, integrated programme and to make the best use of the funds available.

42. The resolution, in three of its operative paragraphs, stresses, as it should, the critical financial position of the Agency and urges all Governments to make the most generous efforts possible not only to meet the Agency's anticipated needs but, particularly, to fill in the budgetary deficit projected by the Commissioner-General.

43. The resolution also stresses the urgent need for rectification which will help ensure that the recipients of the Agency's limited resources are the truly needy. We earnestly hope that the host Governments will give their fullest co-operation to the efforts of the Commissioner-General in this endeavour and we welcome the assurances just made in this connexion by the representative of Jordan.

44. In this connexion, I should also like to reiterate my Government's anxiety, which I expressed in the Committee, concerning reports that men undergoing military training under the auspices of the organization known as the Palestine Liberation Organization have been receiving rations from the United Nations Relief and Works Agency. We firmly maintain our position that such a practice is inadmissible and that firm measures must be taken to eliminate it where it exists. As I said earlier, we would hope to receive further word on this subject from the Agency in the immediate future.

45. Concerning operative paragraph 7 of the resolution, my country as a member of the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine, will give full attention to the recommendation set forth in that paragraph.

46. Finally, I wish to reiterate our satisfaction that the resolution, while it is somewhat different in wording from the draft earlier tabled by my delegation, has the same equitable quality. It recognizes the needs of the refugees and it seeks to meet those needs to the greatest extent possible. It recognizes the positions of the various parties and, without prejudice to the interests of any, extends the mandate of the Agency for a further three years.

47. We trust that all the Members will join us in facing up to our humanitarian responsibilities, and we trust also that the severe financial problems which threaten the Agency will, through our common efforts, be eased.

48. Mr. EL-KONY (United Arab Republic): I should like first of all to express the appreciation of my delegation to the Nigerian delegation and, in particular, to Chief Adebo for having presented a draft resolution which has now secured the approval of an overwhelming majority of the United Nations. As he rightly stated, this resolution was drafted after wide and extensive consultations which took much time and effort.

49. My delegation voted in favour of that resolution. However, we believe that such a resolution of this body should have included a more specific reference to the fact that no just solution of the problem of the refugees can be achieved without full respect for their rights, which have been reaffirmed by the General Assembly every year since 1948.

50. Nevertheless, it is noted that this is covered in operative paragraph 1. At the same time, the resolution does not refer specifically to the fact that the longing of the refugees to return to their homes, in conformity with paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194 (III), remains unabated. It should not be overlooked that, as in previous reports, this fact is again prominently stated in the clearest of terms in the current report of the Commissioner-General [A/6013].

51. Paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5 need no comment. As to paragraph 6, my delegation would again wish to refer in this respect to the continued co-operation of the host countries. This is evidenced by the report of the Commissioner-General himself. We understand paragraph 6 to mean that the Commissioner-General is authorized by the General Assembly to continue, with the co-operation of the host Government, to move ahead with a view to seeking, with available funds, ways and means of securing relief for all who, on humanitarian grounds, cannot possibly be denied help from the international community. Justice and humanitarian considerations preclude any restrictive interpretation or limitation of these efforts.

52. As to paragraph 7, I would stress that the Conciliation Commission is called upon "to intensify its efforts for the implementation of paragraph 11 of resolution 194 (III)", the implementation of which is the corner-stone, as it has always been.

53. Paragraph 8 is self-explanatory and needs no comment from me.

54. I would add only that the rights of the Palestine Arab refugees to their homeland is a national and

inalienable right of a people deprived of their homes who will continue to seek the redress of a grave injustice until they are restored to their country.

55. Mr. COMAY (Israel): My delegation fully supports the extension of the mandate of UNRWA, and wishes once more to commend the Commissioner-General and his staff for their fine humanitarian work, as well as the contributing countries whose generosity has made that work possible. Our vote on the resolution which has just been adopted does not imply any reservation regarding the extension of the mandate of UNRWA or its financial needs. We are in full agreement with the imperative need to rectify its rolls.

56. We also note that a number of objectionable amendments which were voted into the United States draft resolution in the Special Political Committee [see A/6115 and Corr.1, paras. 8-13] have since then been abandoned and do not figure in the draft resolution which was submitted at this plenary meeting [A/L.474] by the Nigerian delegation. Among the deleted amendments were four new preambular paragraphs, with their thinly veiled language of belligerence. Another deletion was the reference to proposals in the Commissioner-General's report [A/6013] which would have swelled the refugee rolls with a vast number of non-refugees, as well as perpetuating the problem into the indefinite future by including the third and subsequent generations.

57. A third aspect of the Nigerian resolution is that it no longer contains any reference to the alleged "rights" of the refugees. This deletion is highly significant, because the debate in the Committee made abundantly clear what a far-reaching and dangerous interpretation has been given to this term by Arab spokesmen.

58. The amended draft resolution which emerged from the Committee was a very contentious political document, the endorsement of which would have inflamed still further the situation in the Middle East. Due to a sense of realism and responsibility of a large number of delegations, the draft resolution adopted in the Committee was not pressed in the plenary.

59. The same sense of realism and responsibility motivated the attitude of many delegations toward certain other abortive initiatives taken at the Committee stage, which are referred to in the Rapporteur's report. In granting certain persons a hearing, the Committee decided that this did not imply any recognition of the organizations they claimed to represent. A proposal to appoint a United Nations property custodian, in disregard of Israel's sovereignty, was defeated, and a suggested amendment directly critical of Israel was dropped without a vote. All these matters bear witness to the reluctance of the bulk of the United Nations Member States to co-operate in the attempt to exploit the refugee problem for political purposes.

60. While the draft resolution which has just been adopted was unacceptable to my delegation, we appreciate the spirit in which it was put forward by the representative of Nigeria, Chief Adebo.

61. As the sponsor of the original draft resolution in the Committee, the United States representative

made an important statement in the Committee on 9 November [450th meeting] clarifying a number of points, including the third generation of refugees, the so-called "other claimants for relief", the recruitment of refugees for military purposes and the need for a peaceful reconciliation between the parties. It is my delegation's understanding that these positions have been maintained by the United States in relation to the resolution which has now been adopted.

62. In spite of the positive aspects of the matter to which I have referred, my delegation and my Government are deeply concerned at the failure of the resolution to come to grips with the essence of the problem or to open a door to a constructive solution of it. I have no doubt that most delegations represented here share our conviction that such a solution requires agreement between the Governments concerned—an agreement freely negotiated by them and reconciling the real interests and welfare of the refugees with the sovereignty, national security and economic life of the countries involved.

63. But the present solution neither gives expression to this objective, nor does it confine itself to the humanitarian and practical aspects of the refugee problem. Instead, it keeps United Nations policy on this problem a prisoner of a single paragraph torn out of the context of a resolution [194 (III)] which, in its paragraph 5, called upon the Governments concerned "to seek agreement by negotiations conducted either with the Conciliation Commission or directly, with a view to the final settlement of all questions outstanding between them". This provision is completely ignored by the present resolution, while paragraph 11 of that resolution, with its very meaning and interpretation a matter of sterile controversy, is heavily overemphasized. In fact, that paragraph has managed to get itself mentioned no less than three times. Whatever the reasons for this may have been, we cannot regard the invocation of that paragraph as a substitute for a policy or a programme.

64. In casting its vote, the Israel delegation took into account the fact that the Arab Governments have made of paragraph 11 a banner of belligerency. Israel cannot allow itself to be insensitive to the political and even military overtones that this acquires in the area itself.

65. What Israel wants is that the United Nations should courageously return to recognition of the need for an Israel-Arab dialogue. Israel is convinced that if there were a sincere desire on the part of the Arab Governments to enter into such a dialogue, with a view to a peaceful solution, all outstanding problems, including the refugee question, could be resolved.

66. It is the Arab Governments that have to decide whether they wish for a peaceful accommodation with Israel or not. And unless and until they choose to walk with us the path of peaceful accommodation, there is little the Government of Israel can do unilaterally to help solve the refugee problem.

67. There can be no compromise between peace and war. Endless repetition of paragraph 11 cannot release the Members of the United Nations from the injunction in paragraph 3 of Article 2 of the United Nations

Charter which declares that all Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means. It is in the spirit of this provision that Israel calls for a settlement of its conflict—including the refugee problem—with its neighbours. That is the only way to promote the peace and welfare of our region as a whole.

68. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): The Syrian delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution [A/L.474] submitted by the representative of Nigeria, basically and primarily in a spirit of compromise.

69. It will be recalled that in the Special Political Committee four operative paragraphs were voted upon which have been dropped from the present draft resolution. However, paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194 (III) is mentioned and affirmed in the resolution in three of its operative paragraphs, namely, paragraphs 1, 7 and 8. It will also be recalled that in the Special Political Committee the amendment submitted by the delegation of Israel calling for negotiations with the Arab States was withdrawn by that delegation [A/6115 and Corr.1, paras. 9-11].

70. We wish first to express our thanks to the representative of Nigeria for his effort in presenting this compromise draft resolution, and also to the Commissioner-General of UNRWA for his untiring efforts, as well as to the contributing countries of UNRWA.

71. In addressing myself to the resolution, I wish first to direct attention to operative paragraph 6, which deals with the rectification of the relief rolls. In the report of the Commissioner-General submitted to the General Assembly on the work of the Agency between 1 July 1964 and 30 June 1965 [A/6013], it is made abundantly clear that the host Governments have been co-operating with the Commissioner-General to rectify the relief rolls. The representatives of the host Governments, of which I am one, have said time and again that they favour rectification of the relief rolls and that, in fact, the rolls have been rectified to a large extent. On the other hand, we note here that the rectification of the relief rolls should take into consideration the most equitable distribution of relief based on need. It is our understanding that this paragraph will not tie the hands of the Commissioner-General and that it is only with the full co-operation of the host Governments, which have declared their readiness to co-operate, that this problem can be solved.

72. It is also our understanding that the third generation of refugees is involved in this problem, a generation that was not born to be condemned to die, a generation that has the right to live under the Declaration on Human Rights and entitled to all forms of consideration, legal, charitable, humanitarian and all others.

73. I address myself now to operative paragraphs 1, 6 and 7. Emphasis is laid here on General Assembly resolution 194 (III); it has been repeated in operative paragraphs 7 and 8. While dealing with the problem of the refugees, we should not at any time lose sight of the fact that it is just a part of a more general problem, the problem of Palestine. The problem of the refugees of Palestine is only a side issue of that main problem. In order to illustrate this point I

quote from the introduction to the report of the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East for the period 1 July 1964 to 30 June 1965. The Commissioner-General states:

"The attitudes and feelings of the refugees, which have been described in previous reports, continue unchanged. From their standpoint, a nation has been obliterated and a population arbitrarily deprived of its birthright. This injustice still festers in their minds and they hold the United Nations responsible for their lot and for extending assistance to them until a solution can be found to their problems. Their longing to return to their homes, encouraged by the General Assembly's declaration on repatriation and compensation in paragraph 11 of resolution 194 (III) and referred to in many subsequent resolutions, remains unabated." [A/6013, para. 6.]

Therefore, the relevance and direct relationship between resolution 194 (III) and the problem of the refugees is abundantly affirmed.

74. Furthermore, these rights of the refugees are formulated in resolution 194 (III) in which the General Assembly

"Resolves that the refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbours should be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date, and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return and for loss of or damage to property which, under principles of international law or in equity, should be made good by the Governments or authorities responsible."

75. That paragraph has been reaffirmed in sixteen subsequent paragraphs of United Nations resolutions adopted between 1949 and 1963. Is it by mere coincidence or chance that the basic principle of that paragraph giving the Arab refugees the right to repatriation or compensation, under the principles of international law or in equity, has been affirmed sixteen times since the founding of the United Nations?

76. Furthermore, we emphasize that the statement in operative paragraph 1 of the resolution, whereby the Assembly

"Notes with deep regret that repatriation or compensation of the refugees as provided for in paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194 (III) has not been effected ..."

has been reaffirmed in ten resolutions of the General Assembly of the United Nations between 1949 and 1958.

77. It is quite understandable that the party which is standing in the way of the fulfilment of the rights of the Arab refugees is Israel, which is defying those resolutions. We therefore completely understand why we have just heard from the Israel speaker that there are no rights of the refugees. But those rights exist. They are God-given rights. They are inalienable rights. And no solution of the Arab-Palestine problem can be envisaged or contemplated until those rights have been confirmed, respected and taken into full consideration by the parties concerned—and here the first party concerned is the State of Israel.

78. We have heard also the statement that, in order to reach a solution concerning those rights, agreement should be sought between the Arab States and Israel. For that purpose a Conciliation Commission was established by the United Nations in order to seek ways and means leading to a solution, with particular reference to what has been affirmed in resolution 194 (III). The party that refused and placed handicaps and difficulties in the way of conciliation was the State of Israel.

79. What are the problems that stand in the way of conciliation? The repatriation of refugees? There has been no repatriation. Israel occupied lands beyond its borders. There has been no retreat from any part of those lands aggressively occupied. And Jerusalem: Israel, in defiance of United Nations resolutions, declared Jerusalem its capital and occupied it by military force. And now the representative of the most aggressive State, the State most condemned by the United Nations, comes before us to accuse the Arabs of non-co-operation.

80. Furthermore, with particular reference to the question of negotiations, the two parties concerned are primarily the Israel authorities and the Arabs of Palestine. There are 2.5 million Arabs of Palestine who have the right to be heard; they have not been heard and they have been completely disregarded in this whole problem. Unless the Arabs of Palestine take the stand as the representatives of their cause, we, the other Arab States, cannot enter into negotiations. We cannot negotiate concerning the inalienable rights of another party.

81. Finally, in view of the above considerations and in view of the fact that resolution 194 (III) has been affirmed in the three operative paragraphs of the resolution just adopted, my delegation voted for this resolution, but only in a spirit of compromise.

82. Mr. TARCICI (Yemen) (translated from French): The delegation of Yemen has just voted in favour of the Nigerian draft resolution [A/L.474]. Although the resolution which has been adopted gives my delegation no satisfaction whatever on the substance of the Palestine problem, which continues to preoccupy the conscience of mankind and the solution of which consists in restoring to the people of Palestine their legitimate rights, we nevertheless considered that it would help the Commissioner-General in his difficult task.

83. As the representative of Nigeria has stated, this resolution gives the Commissioner-General the necessary latitude to rectify the relief rolls in co-operation with the host Governments. This should protect the rights of those recently born in the camps, i.e., the third-generation refugees.

84. It is with this interpretation and its significance clearly in mind that my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution which has just been adopted by a very large majority.

85. Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait): My delegation was not present when the roll-call vote was taken. May I take this opportunity to state before this body that had my delegation been present it would have voted for the draft resolution which has just been voted

upon. However, I should like to state, on behalf of my delegation, that this can in no way prejudice the position of principle of my Government towards the whole problem of Palestine, and especially towards the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine to their homeland and to the restoration of their national sovereignty.

86. It has been declared before this body that there can be no compromise between war and peace. But peace can be constructed and maintained only on justice. And for us, for the United Nations, there should not be a compromise between justice and injustice, between right and wrong. The right of Palestine is a birthright, an inalienable right, of which the people of Palestine have been deprived only by violence, by aggression and by usurpation.

87. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): I should like to take this opportunity to explain why my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution presented to the Assembly by the representative of Nigeria. My delegation would have preferred to have seen the draft resolution recommended by the Special Political Committee adopted by the Assembly but, the political situation being as it is, my delegation voted for the Nigerian resolution in a spirit of compromise because it does contain several of the points which my delegation advocated in the Special Political Committee.

88. Those points referred to the need to make specific reference to paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194 (III). We felt that that paragraph should be embodied in whatever resolution was approved by the General Assembly. We asked for the insertion of operative paragraph 1 and urged that the Conciliation Commission should intensify rather than merely continue its efforts for the implementation of paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194 (III). We suggested a definite date, 1 October 1966, for the Commission to report back to the General Assembly in order to underline the urgency of the matter. In this paragraph also, we sought to ensure that, in extending the Agency's mandate, the only true and just solution of the problem, namely repatriation or compensation, would not be forgotten.

89. The main considerations behind several of the amendments moved by my delegation in the Special Political Committee and embodied in the draft resolution adopted by that Committee, arose from the fact that, sixteen years ago, in its resolution 302 (IV), establishing the Relief and Works Agency, the Assembly recognized "that constructive measures should be taken at an early date with a view to the termination of international assistance for relief". The measures were to be taken, the resolution further explained, without prejudice to the provisions of paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194 (III). In other words, the Agency was envisaged as being an emergency measure of short duration to provide for the desperate position of the refugees until they could return to their homes or receive compensation for the loss of their property. The very valuable and necessary work of the Agency has continued year after year to obtain the support of the Assembly. But the more important objective of putting an end to the need for the work of the Agency has all but faded from view.

90. At this session, as in past years, the tendency has been to formulate a resolution on the Palestine question which is so concerned with reconciling diametrically opposed points of view that the interest of those concerned, namely, the refugees, has been relegated to second place. I am sure that all will agree with me when I define the interest of the refugees as being the speedy termination of a situation that involves considerable human suffering. The measures necessary to end that suffering were formulated in General Assembly resolution 194 (III), which can be ignored only if this Assembly has no respect for its own decisions, and if Member States can disregard those decisions with impunity. It is a sad commentary on how far we have travelled from the original intentions of the General Assembly when there can be doubts and questions about the rights of the Palestine refugees to be repatriated or to receive fair compensation for their losses.

91. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I invite the Assembly to consider agenda item 101, on which the Special Political Committee has submitted two draft resolutions [A/6158, para. 12].

92. Mr. AIKEN (Ireland): Members of the Assembly will note that draft resolution B recommended by the Special Political Committee [A/6158, para. 12] invites the Committee of Thirty-three to give draft resolution A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1 its careful consideration. On behalf of the co-sponsors of that draft—Ceylon, Costa Rica, Ghana, Ireland, the Ivory Coast, Liberia, Nepal, the Philippines and Somalia, I wish to thank the co-sponsors of draft resolution B and indeed the many other delegations also, for their courteous references to the work of our delegations in a search for a solution of the question of peace-keeping operations.

93. Although we co-sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/L.121 did our utmost to get the Special Political Committee to take a decision upon the text of our draft resolution, we are fully aware that only very few of those who did not vote with us take the stand that the Assembly has no right to recommend peace-keeping operations and has no right to make mandatory assessments to pay for them. Indeed, we know that the great majority of these delegations differed from us only on the question of the time when these issues should be brought to a head.

94. We hope that those representatives who voted in the Special Political Committee for draft resolution B and who disagreed with us only on a matter of timing, will prove to have been right in moving to postpone a decision and that, long before the need arises, the Committee of Thirty-three will have decided what system of reliable financing for peace-keeping operations it should recommend to the Assembly.

95. We sincerely hope, too, that it will be a system which will ensure that a small nation which has been promised peace-keeping assistance from the United Nations will not find that promise betrayed through lack of the necessary funds.

96. We trust that all the Member States which wish to uphold the Assembly's right to recommend a peace-keeping operation, and its right to make mandatory

assessments for peace-keeping and for all other purposes of the United Nations, will maintain a keen and active interest in these questions in the months immediately ahead. We appeal to them to keep urging their friends on the Committee of Thirty-three to uphold these principles and to press for a speedy decision and report on the most urgent aspects of the problem of peace-keeping—that is, the method by which the Assembly should ensure that peace-keeping operations are reliably financed.

97. Finally, I would appeal to all five permanent members of the Security Council to recognize that stable peace and progress depends not only on their ability to avoid nuclear war among themselves but also upon their wisdom and willingness to act as constitutional co-sponsors, prepared to recognize and respect the lawful rights of the other 112 Members of the United Nations in the field of peace-keeping and in the apportionment of assessments for all expenses of the Organization.

98. Mr. NACO (Albania) (translated from French): The delegation of the People's Republic of Albania voted in the Special Political Committee against the two draft resolutions A/SPC/L.122 and Add.1 and A/SPC/L.124 on the question of United Nations military operations, in keeping with our well-known position on this matter. As we have often stated here, United Nations forces have not hitherto served the cause of international peace and security. On the contrary, they have been used, in violation of the basic principles of the Charter, in the interests of imperialists and aggressors and to the detriment of the victims of aggression; they have served as a useful instrument for armed intervention in the domestic affairs of States and peoples, for the benefit of the imperialists and colonialists. The case of Korea and that of the Congo are typical instances. The history of the United Nations forces is a bitter one and must inevitably lead the peaceful Member States to reflect on the dangerous results which the establishment of such forces might have for peoples struggling for freedom and independence.

99. The Albanian Government will never agree to fall in with the ambitions of the protagonists—two great Powers, in particular—of such projects, the aim of which is to use the United Nations forces as an international police force to repress popular liberation movements and revolutionary movements.

100. It is necessary to point out once again that the first step which is needed now in order to safeguard and strengthen the United Nations is to free it from the harmful domination of the United States of America. This is a prerequisite if the Organization is ever to be able to follow the path laid down by the Charter, if it is to become an effective instrument for peace, freedom and international co-operation.

101. The Albanian Government, for its part, is, and always has been, opposed to the establishment of United Nations forces in present circumstances. Our position with regard to the past or future costs of such forces is also unchanged. For reasons which we have previously explained, we shall not agree to contribute to these costs.

102. In view of the brief comments I have just made, which reflect our firm position on this question, we shall vote against the draft resolutions of the Special Political Committee.

103. Mr. VINCI (Italy): May I, first of all, express the appreciation of the Italian delegation for the excellent work done by the Rapporteur, Mr. Lannung, in having prepared a comprehensive and lucid report on the intricate matter of peace-keeping operations as well as on the other two items allocated to the Special Political Committee and then submitted to the plenary.

104. As a co-sponsor of both the draft resolutions on peace-keeping operations to be put to the vote today, I feel it is my duty to make some brief remarks.

105. I shall not dwell on draft resolution A which received very wide support in the Special Political Committee and which, I am confident, will be adopted this morning by the overwhelming majority of the General Assembly. My comments will therefore be restricted to the draft resolution which appears under B in the report of the Special Political Committee. I should like, in fact, to take this opportunity to underline the motives which guided the Italian delegation in co-sponsoring this draft in the Special Political Committee, where it was adopted by a large majority.

106. At the outset of the debate in the Special Political Committee on the problems of peace-keeping operations, the Foreign Minister of Ireland submitted [438th meeting] a complete plan which was the first concrete step toward the building up of an effective machinery of peace-keeping and toward its financing. The principles and ideas embodied in the Irish draft resolution [see A/5966/Rev.2] were favourably received by a large majority of Member States. Many delegations, including my own, found in those ideas a correct approach, a realistic approach, to coping with the problems connected with the establishment of an effective system in the field of peace-keeping. But at the same time there was, in the course of the debate in the Special Political Committee, the feeling that a discussion of the substance of the Irish proposal at the present stage, and in that context, could seriously impair the chances of a future satisfactory solution of this problem so vital for the future of our world Organization.

107. The Italian delegation shared both the appreciation for the proposals put forward by Mr. Aiken and the feeling of concern about discussing and voting on them at this stage. As I had the opportunity to state in the Special Political Committee [482nd meeting], we feared, together with other delegations, that this course of action would hamper the good spirit of harmony and co-operation which has prevailed throughout the entire discussion on peace-keeping and, for that matter, during the entire twentieth session of the General Assembly—a spirit of harmony and co-operation which, I feel, is an essential prerequisite for advancing toward a final solution that will put the United Nations in a position to become a really effective instrument in the keeping of international peace and security.

108. Therefore, when we decided to become a co-sponsor of what is now draft resolution B, despite our reservations concerning operative paragraph 2, we certainly had no intention of displaying antagonism towards the draft resolution put forward by the Irish delegation, together with some other delegations. What we had and still have in mind is rather to preserve the substance of the draft resolution, which is of paramount value to the activities of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations.

109. I should like to pay a tribute to the Foreign Minister of Ireland for his statesmanship. In his statement a few moments ago, Mr. Aiken again demonstrated that he possesses that quality to the highest degree. Our confidence is strengthened that the position of the Irish delegation towards our draft resolution will change. As a matter of fact we are more certain than ever that by draft resolution B which was introduced in the Special Political Committee by the Tunisian delegation and co-sponsored by Denmark, Finland, Italy, Nigeria, Norway, Sudan, Sweden and Syria, we have served a good cause in preserving the full validity and strength of the Irish draft, which will be further examined by the Special Committee of Thirty-three—and we are sure that by an almost unanimous decision of the General Assembly the mandate of the Special Committee will be renewed.

110. When I spoke in the Special Political Committee, I pledged the utmost co-operation of the Italian delegation in the future activities of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations. I am sure that that is the spirit prevailing amongst the vast majority of the Members of our Organization. I do hope that in this spirit both draft resolutions which we have co-sponsored will today receive the support of the overwhelming majority of the Assembly.

111. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I invite the Assembly to vote on draft resolutions A and B submitted by the Special Political Committee [A/6158, para. 12].

Draft resolution A was adopted by 87 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 93 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions.

112. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The voting which has just taken place emphasizes the importance of the task which the General Assembly has decided to request the Special Committee to continue. This decision gives us grounds for hoping that the entire matter will continue to be studied within the United Nations in an atmosphere of harmony and co-operation. There is now provision for the counsel of the President of the Assembly and the close collaboration of the Secretary-General in this connexion.

113. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): In connexion with the vote just taken on resolution B [A/6158, para. 12], the adoption of which was recommended in the report of the Special Political Committee, the Soviet delegation deems it necessary, as it did in the corresponding case when the draft of this resolution was voted upon in the Special Political Committee, to state the following.

114. We found it possible not to oppose the adoption of this resolution because it is purely procedural in character and is in conformity with the previously adopted resolution A [ibid.], for which the Soviet delegation voted and which transmits to the Committee of Thirty-three the records of the debates on agenda item 101, entitled "Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects".

115. As regards the substance of the Irish proposal [A/5966/Rev.2], the Soviet delegation reaffirms the position of principle which it has consistently taken on this proposal—which is contrary to the Charter of our Organization—in the General Committee, at the 1336th plenary meeting of the General Assembly at the present session, and at the 465th, 486th and 488th meetings of the Special Political Committee.

116. The Irish proposal, as we have repeatedly stated and find it necessary to state once again now, is directed against the Charter of our Organization. Its object is the circumvention of the Security Council, the sole organ of the United Nations competent to take action for the maintenance of international peace and security in precisely those matters which involve the use of armed force in the name of the Organization. Thus, whatever may be said on this score here, the Irish proposal is essentially a dangerous proposal and one which runs counter to the basic provisions of the United Nations Charter. Its purpose is to undermine the Charter's key provisions. We therefore wish to reaffirm most emphatically our opposition to the Irish proposal. We intend to take the same position in the Committee of Thirty-three when it discusses that proposal.

117. As the Soviet delegation has repeatedly stated, the Soviet Union is prepared to co-operate in efforts to strengthen the effectiveness of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security on the basis of strict compliance with the United Nations Charter and the use of the broad possibilities which the Charter offers in this regard. The constructive programme proposed by the Soviet Union in the Memorandum of 10 July 1964 regarding certain measures to strengthen the effectiveness of the United Nations,^{1/} and in the statements made by Soviet representatives at meetings of the Committee of Thirty-three during 1965, should be of assistance in this matter.

118. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I have already made clear in the Special Political Committee [464th meeting] the reasons why my Government is in favour of the two resolutions on which we have voted.

119. We have paid our sincere tribute to the contribution made by the Foreign Minister of Ireland in the long and constructive debate on this subject in the Special Political Committee. We pay a further tribute to him today, following what he said to us just now. We shall remember his words. We shall heed his advice, and we trust that the principles and purposes for which he has striven so gallantly will prevail. As we continue in our efforts, we shall be guided and inspired by his example of Irish persuasiveness and

Irish determination. We in England have long had opportunity to realize how persuasive and determined Irishmen can be. When, as we confidently hope, we reach before long a satisfactory conclusion, we shall remember and revere the admirable part he has played in making that possible.

120. We ourselves were fully convinced that the right course was to call on the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations to resume its work in accordance with the mandate given to it by this Assembly [resolution 2006 (XIX)], to take into full account the proposals put forward by the Irish delegation [see A/5966/Rev.2], together with all other proposals, and to make a further and final effort to narrow the area of disagreement and to achieve the highest level of general assent and accord.

121. We have made it clear, moreover, that, in spite of the differences which still exist and the very real difficulties still to be overcome, we believe that in this vital endeavour we can succeed. We place our trust in the determination of the general membership to preserve and develop the peace-keeping capacity of the United Nations.

122. It is in that trust that we have confidence that the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations will now urgently undertake a new and successful endeavour to achieve the best result, a result which will command the overwhelming support of all those who wish to see the United Nations effective and efficient.

123. Mr. PHILLIPS (Ghana): The delegation of Ghana voted against what is now draft resolution B in the Special Political Committee, because in our opinion it sought to deny the right of a group of independent and sovereign States which felt the need for the Committee's decision on this important matter. Therefore our vote was purely against procedural tactics which we could not and cannot endorse.

124. My delegation has now voted for the same draft resolution, because that situation no longer existed, since draft resolution A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1 was not before the Assembly.

125. Mr. BOYE (Chile) (translated from Spanish): My delegation would like to state its reasons for voting in favour of draft resolutions A and B [A/6158] despite the fact that it voted against the second one in the Special Political Committee.

126. There was really no difference of opinion regarding the substance; it was merely a matter of showing our concern that there was not sufficient progress on this question and that the General Assembly was not going to reach a more definite agreement by the end of its session. That is why my delegation favoured the adoption of the draft resolution submitted by Ireland and other States [A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1]. That text provided a sound basis for more fruitful work in the future.

127. I should like to commend the Government of Ireland and its Minister for Foreign Affairs for their constructive action in this Assembly. Since the Irish draft resolution was not put to the vote at this plenary meeting and my delegation has no objection to the substance of the draft resolutions that were put to the

^{1/} Official Records of the General Assembly Nineteenth Session, Annexes, annex No. 21, document A/5721.

vote, it decided to support the resolutions we have just adopted. In so doing, it wishes to demonstrate its desire to co-operate to the full in the constructive consideration of this question, which is so vital to world peace.

128. Mrs. BARISH (Costa Rica) (translated from Spanish): The Costa Rican delegation considered it an honour and a source of great satisfaction to be able to join the delegations of Ireland, Ceylon, the Ivory Coast, the Philippines, Ghana, Liberia, Nepal and Somalia in sponsoring the draft resolution submitted to the Special Political Committee in document A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1.

129. The head of my delegation explained the position of Costa Rica in detail during the debate in the Special Political Committee. We felt that the draft resolution represented a realistic and practical approach to the complex problem of peace-keeping operations, particularly because it reaffirmed the obligations and right of all States Members of the United Nations to work together for the maintenance of peace while at the same time recognizing the special responsibility and authority of the Security Council.

130. Unfortunately, the draft resolution was not put to the vote and we should therefore like to express our appreciation and admiration to the Irish delegation and to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ireland for their tireless devotion to the cause of peace.

131. It was in that spirit of appreciation that we voted at this plenary meeting in favour of draft resolution B appearing in paragraph 12 of document A/6158, which has now been adopted and which was submitted in the Special Political Committee by the delegations of Denmark, Finland, Italy, Nigeria, Norway, Sudan, Sweden, Syria and Tunisia.

132. Mr. FAKHER ED DINE (Sudan): In casting an affirmative vote for draft resolution A, my delegation wishes to express its appreciation of the work of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations and to endorse and welcome the extension of the mandate to continue its endeavours. In the meantime, with your permission, Mr. President, we wish to take this opportunity to affirm our unswerving adherence to the principles and objectives of this Organization by responding to the call previously made upon Member States by the President of the General Assembly and the Secretary-General to make voluntary contributions to help to alleviate the difficult financial situation in which the Organization finds itself.

133. In response to this appeal, and in spite of our limited financial resources, the Sudan Government has decided to make a voluntary contribution of \$100,000. We have already communicated this decision of the Sudan Government to the Secretary-General and we hope that, by this action, we shall have contributed our fair share.

134. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We shall now take up item 36 of the agenda, on which the Special Political Committee has submitted two draft resolutions [A/6159, para. 17].

135. Mr. PACHECO (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A [A/6159, para. 17]. The main reservation which we had during

the debate in the Special Committee has disappeared with the deletion by the sponsors of the original operative paragraph 1.

136. When resolution 1761 (XVII) was adopted, my delegation was obliged to abstain, as we thought, and still think, that sanctions which are not implemented by all Member States weaken the United Nations and thus hamper its fight against racial discrimination in South Africa.

137. With regard to the draft resolution on which the Assembly is about to vote, the Brazilian delegation would like to stress an important point. In all fairness, we are not sure about the wisdom of asking the Security Council to embark upon the application of Chapter VII of the Charter. It is up to the Council to examine the situation and to decide what measures should be taken. With this reservation, the Brazilian delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution. This reservation, however, should not be construed as any hesitation in our strongly condemning the policy of apartheid of the Government of South Africa. Apartheid is surely the most brutal negation of one of the highest values of Brazilian culture and civilization in our multiracial society.

138. Mr. NIELSEN (Norway): The policy of apartheid pursued by the Government of South Africa has led to humiliating human conditions for the large majority of the people of South Africa. This situation has created a state of tension which, if allowed to continue, may result in dangerous conflicts. It is our view, therefore, that the United Nations should be used to its capacity in search of a peaceful solution to this crisis.

139. If the United Nations, in the way prescribed in the Charter, should decide to impose economic sanctions against South Africa, it would be the policy of my Government loyally to respect such a decision. We have recently had a chance to prove our professed intentions. Norway was among the first Member countries to take the required measures in full to implement the decision taken by the Security Council with regard to Southern Rhodesia.

140. We believe, on the other hand, that it would not be right to overlook the fact that sanctions against South Africa may prove to be extremely difficult to carry out. Most likely, such sanctions would lead to a long process of attrition with consequences which, in the first instance, would affect the majority of the population which we want to help.

141. The Security Council is the competent organ to decide whether a threat to international peace and security exists and whether sanctions or other means are to be applied to meet that threat. Respect for the relationship stipulated in the Charter between the Security Council and the General Assembly has in fact proved to be indispensable if the United Nations is to be an efficient instrument for the preservation of peace. It is the Security Council, and the Security Council alone, which has the authority to stipulate if a situation or a crisis is of such a nature that sanctions should be imposed. We may regret it, but we all know that it is only the Security Council which has the means to carry out a decision regarding the imposition of sanctions.

142. But this by no means implies that my Government holds that the General Assembly should remain silent on such a vital matter as apartheid. On the contrary, through its recommendations and as a vehicle of world opinion, the General Assembly can and should exert its influence on the Security Council. In our view, however, the draft resolution proposed to this Assembly goes beyond that. This is the case particularly concerning operative paragraph 6 of this draft. That paragraph states as a fact that a threat to international peace and security exists and that measures under Chapter VII of the Charter should be applied, and that the only peaceful solution to the problem consists in universally applied sanctions. In our view, this is not an appropriate recommendation to the Council, but a detailed prescription to it on how to act.

143. I also want to draw attention to the fact that, in the last preambular paragraph of this draft resolution proposed to us, resolution 1761 (XVII) of 16 June 1962 is recalled. That resolution contained a recommendation to the Security Council to consider exclusion of South Africa from this Organization. Norway maintains that membership in the United Nations should be universal. Our Organization comprises all States, also States whose system of government we abhor and whose action we condemn. But how can we hope to influence a State if that State is not a member of this Organization?

144. For these reasons of principle, Norway will abstain from voting on the draft resolution before us.

145. Before closing, I wish to draw attention to the fact that, as a member of the Security Council in the years 1963 and 1964, Norway explored every possible means of bringing about valid decisions of the Council aimed at curbing the abhorrent policy of apartheid. Norway took the initiative in the Council which led to a ban on export of arms and matériel that could be used for the production of arms in South Africa. Norway, together with Bolivia, also took the initiative in establishing the Group of Experts, the Committee of the Council which undertook a technical and practical study of the feasibility, effectiveness and implications of measures that could be taken against South Africa under the Charter. The Security Council has not yet considered the report of this Committee.^{2/}

146. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): I made a full statement in the Special Political Committee [472nd meeting] on the position and policy of my Government on the questions raised in this resolution, and I do not need or wish to go over that ground now. I should, however, emphasize that my delegation's abstention on the vote on the draft resolution as a whole, especially when it contains language in certain paragraphs against which my delegation has found it necessary to vote, does not create a precedent for any future debate on this subject in the Security Council.

147. Moreover, my delegation wishes to record that there are certain other reservations and objections in regard to this draft resolution which we would have stated in detail had there been a separate vote on each of its paragraphs. I wish to mention only two.

^{2/} See Official Records of the Security Council, Nineteenth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1964, document S/5658.

With regard to the paragraph concerning the specialized agencies, our view is that these agencies, having urgent and important practical work to do, should not dissipate time and energy in controversy over political matters, which are properly the concern of the United Nations itself. Moreover, we support the principle of universality, and we believe that these agencies should be open to all Members of the United Nations.

148. I also wish to state that we are unable to accept the recommendation in the draft resolution dealing with the Special Committee.

149. Let me also take this opportunity to refer to the resolution dealing with the trust fund. My Government has already made a contribution to the United Nations South African Education and Training Programme, and when I spoke in the Special Political Committee on 1 December [472nd meeting], I stated my Government's readiness to consider the setting up of a trust fund. We were glad to vote in support of the draft resolution proposing the establishment of such a fund, and while we cannot make a commitment now, I have already said that, subject to a scheme being satisfactorily worked out, and when it is clear that it can become a practical reality, my Government will be glad to consider contributing to it.

150. Mr. LANNUNG (Denmark): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution on apartheid adopted by the Special Political Committee on 7 December [A/6159, para. 17, draft resolution A]. We shall take the same stand when the draft resolution is put to the vote in this Assembly. My delegation could not, however, and still cannot, support all the paragraphs of the draft. I have, therefore, been instructed to make the following comments in explanation of our vote in the Committee as well as in the Assembly.

151. It will be recalled that in my delegation's intervention in the Special Political Committee on 3 December [476th meeting], it was stated that my Government finds that the situation now prevailing in South Africa constitutes a threat to international peace and security. This is, in our opinion, the fundamental and crucial question in relation to the United Nations, and a consensus on this point in the General Assembly implies that the General Assembly can recommend to the Security Council that it consider how sanctions, under Chapter VII of the Charter, could effectively be imposed on South Africa.

152. We had hoped that the co-sponsors of the draft resolution [*ibid.*, para. 10] would have presented this problem clearly and unambiguously. However, the draft deals also with some well-known and controversial issues. We appreciate the amendments which Mr. Achkar of Guinea introduced on behalf of the co-sponsors at the meeting of the Special Political Committee on 7 December [*ibid.*, para. 11]; we regard them as improvements, but they do not remove all our objections, and the draft resolution still creates certain difficulties for my Government.

153. Without going into detail, I should like to make a few remarks about the paragraphs which Denmark cannot support. In our opinion the provisions of operative paragraph 1 and, presumably, operative paragraph 10 go beyond the competence of the General

Assembly. We have taken a similar stand during previous sessions, and in consequence we did not vote in favour of resolution 1761 (XVII).

154. Furthermore, the Danish Government cannot accept that the type of criticism found in operative paragraph 7 be expressed, since it was clear from the debate in the Special Political Committee that criticism was levelled against States whose Governments cannot justly be criticized in that manner, and whose co-operation is of the utmost significance for the successful outcome of our endeavours.

155. May I, in conclusion, express the hope that the draft resolution, in spite of its shortcomings, will mark an important step forward towards our common goal, the speedy and final elimination of apartheid.

156. Mr. ASTROM (Sweden): The Swedish delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A as reported to the General Assembly by the Special Political Committee [A/6159, para. 17]. I should like to explain briefly why we shall do so.

157. Speaking in the general debate on 6 October of this year, Sweden's Minister for Foreign Affairs stated our basic position as follows:

"There is no doubt that the policy of apartheid in South Africa is a hindrance to peaceful evolution on the whole continent of Africa and may have the most serious repercussions also in other parts of the world. In the interest of the African peoples"—indeed in the interest of decent men everywhere—"the United Nations should bring increasing pressure to bear on the South African Government and take other steps aimed at opening prospects for a future in freedom and dignity for all people in South Africa. We still believe that this dual approach to the problem is the most promising one. It has our full support." [1350th meeting, para. 85.]

158. He expressed our readiness to join in any action by the international community which can be realistically expected to achieve this objective.

159. It is in the light of these basic considerations that we determined our attitude on the draft resolution in the Special Political Committee. Before this draft resolution was amended by the sponsors in certain important respects late in the afternoon of 7 December, the Swedish delegation was unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole. In particular, we were not prepared to support a paragraph in the operative part which would have reaffirmed a request by the General Assembly to Member countries to undertake enforcement measures against the Government of South Africa. This paragraph, had it remained in the text, would have compelled us to abstain on the draft resolution as a whole. Its removal enabled us to vote for the draft resolution. May I say in passing that we regret that the sponsors did not see fit to give longer time for reflection on this most important change before the vote was taken.

160. The problem raised by the paragraph in question concerns the relative competence of the Security Council and the General Assembly in the field of peace and security. From the moment Sweden entered the United Nations the Swedish Government has made it clear that it attaches decisive importance to this

question. It is in the exclusive competence of the Security Council to decide on enforcement action after having made the finding required under Article 39. We do not deny that the General Assembly is entitled to pass resolutions concerning problems in the field of peace and security. In particular, we feel that the General Assembly has the power, by recommendation, to initiate operations of the kind that have come to be described as peace-keeping operations, inasmuch as such operations are of an essentially voluntary character and do not constitute enforcement action. We consider it in the interest of the world community that this power of the General Assembly be generally recognized, so that, when peace so demands, it can be exercised without controversy of a constitutional character.

161. The problem now before the General Assembly is, however, not one of a peace-keeping operation but one of sanctions against a State. The Swedish Government has consistently taken the position that if enforcement action is to be taken by the United Nations in this matter, it is for the Security Council to take the appropriate decision.

162. The draft resolution before the plenary meeting takes due account of the distinctions I have just mentioned. It does, therefore, not present the difficulty which led us to abstain on resolution 1761 (XVII) of 1962.

163. The Swedish Government has noted with satisfaction that the draft resolution in its present form unequivocally places the responsibility for enforcement action where it belongs, that is on the Security Council. It does so by drawing the attention of the Security Council to the total problem in all its aspects. The meaning of paragraph 6 is that the General Assembly assesses the situation with a view to assisting the Council to arrive at decisions that would be likely to solve the problem.

164. As to the precise content of paragraph 6, the Swedish delegation would be prepared to support the first two parts of the paragraph, were they to be voted on separately, but would have to abstain on the third part. I shall briefly explain why.

165. The Swedish Government has been reluctant to support statements by the General Assembly characterizing a situation as a threat to international peace and security. We hold that it is for the Security Council, rather than for the General Assembly, to make this finding, acting under Article 39 of the Charter. When there has been a need to call the attention of the Security Council to dangerous international situations, we have preferred the Assembly to characterize the situation, in conformity with Article 11, paragraph 3, of the Charter, as "likely to endanger international peace and security". We have done so because we have considered it undesirable for the Assembly to prejudice the finding of whether a situation is, in fact, a threat to international peace and security, a finding which, when made by the Security Council, constitutes a basis for a possible decision on sanctions which would then be firmly founded in the Charter and likely to be effective.

166. However, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that there exists a situation in the southern part of

Africa which is viewed by a growing public opinion all over the world as a threat to the peace in that part of the world and, thereby, as a threat to international peace and security generally. This is a fact of which every responsible Government must be aware and, in spite of the reservations which I have referred to, we do not think that the Assembly in this case should consider itself precluded from pronouncing as its own opinion that the situation constitutes a threat to international peace and security. My Government deems it of great importance to do its part in order to create a growing sense of urgency over this problem and an increased awareness of the serious situation caused by the policy of apartheid. Therefore, we are prepared to accept the first part of paragraph 6. I wish to emphasize strongly, however, that we do not hereby change in any way our view that only if the Security Council has determined the existence of a threat to the peace, is there a legal basis under the Charter for a decision by the Security Council to take measures under Articles 41 and 42 of Chapter VII, that is enforcement action.

167. I now come to the second and third points of operative paragraph 6. Article 11, paragraph 2, of the Charter, prescribes that any question relating to the maintenance of international peace and security on which action is needed shall be referred to the Security Council by the General Assembly. This is exactly what the General Assembly will do according to the second point of paragraph 6, which states that "action under Chapter VII of the Charter is essential in order to solve the problem of apartheid". It is, therefore, acceptable to the Swedish delegation.

168. As to the third part of paragraph 6, we welcome the reference therein to the need for universality in the application of sanctions, should the Security Council take the decision on such measures. We have always stressed this need for concerted world-wide action if the ultimate weapon of the United Nations is to be wielded. We continue to believe that attempts at imposing sanctions which are not supported by one or several of South Africa's main trading partners would be ineffective and, what is more serious, would, if anything, encourage the Government of South Africa to believe that it can with impunity perpetuate its policy of apartheid. The prestige of the United Nations might suffer seriously from such developments.

169. The Swedish Government is not prepared to accept the assertion in the third part of paragraph 6 that economic sanctions are the only means of achieving a peaceful solution of this extremely complicated problem. We continue to hold the view that the United Nations, without wavering in its determination to increase the pressure as long as the Government of South Africa shows no sign of being willing to heed the demands of world opinion, should stand ready to lend its co-operation and assistance to the people of South Africa in order to enable them to determine in common the future of their country in peace and harmony.

170. Now that the Security Council will take up again the question of apartheid—and we hope that this will be done in the near future—the obvious first task will be to consider the applicability and the effectiveness of sanctions. The report of the Expert

Committee^{3/} will form the basis of these discussions. We note that, valuable as this report is, it does not indicate solutions of all the problems involved. An equitable system for sharing the burden that would fall on Member countries consequent upon action by the Security Council would have to be devised. Moreover, further study is required to establish how the implementation of sanctions is to be ensured and, in particular, whether supervision by military forces will be necessary.

171. Finally, I wish to use this opportunity to express the firm expectation of Government that the debate in the Security Council will lead to greater clarity as to the real possibilities of bringing the policy of apartheid to an end through effective measures undertaken by the Council. Should the Council take a decision on such measures, the Swedish Government will immediately and unhesitatingly take necessary action in accordance with its obligations under the Charter.

172. Mr. Shaw (Australia): I wish to speak very briefly in explanation of our vote on draft resolution B [A/6159, para. 17] regarding the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa.

173. The Australian delegation will support the draft resolution for the establishment of a United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa in the belief that the proposals should contribute to the assistance of those requiring it in South Africa or to the assistance of refugees from South Africa. At the same time, I would remind the General Assembly that the Australian Government is administering an extensive foreign economic aid programme, which includes a very large training programme. Within our schemes, we provide training for Africans, and a number of these African trainees are already being welcomed in my country. Because of our commitments under our existing schemes, our support for the draft resolution coming before us should not be taken as constituting a pledge of contributions by my Government.

174. Mr. VINCI (Italy): The position of the Italian delegation on the problem of apartheid has been made abundantly clear on several occasions and has been restated in the course of the recent debate in the Special Political Committee [481st meeting]. We believe, however, that it will help if I restate it again before this Assembly, lest any misunderstanding should remain.

175. The Italian people and Government firmly condemn and deplore all forms of racial discrimination as being contrary to the principles embodied in the Italian Constitution and a rejection of the ideals of the United Nations Charter. Racial discrimination appears to us to be not only a denial of our civilization, but also repulsive to our conscience.

176. Equally firm is our condemnation of the policy of apartheid practised by the Government of the Republic of South Africa.

177. Consistent with these ideas and convictions, the Italian Government has loyally complied with the Security Council resolution withholding the granting of licences for the sale to South Africa both of arms

^{3/} Ibid., Twentieth Year, Special Supplement No. 2 (S/6210 and Add.1).

and of all other military equipment and prohibiting the supply of equipment and materials for the manufacture and maintenance of arms and ammunition, as well as spare parts and accessories.

178. Moreover, the Italian Government, bearing in mind the situation in Southern Rhodesia and in order to prevent any military supplies to South Africa from finding their way to Southern Rhodesia, has recently decided to tighten up still more its controls in regard to exports to South Africa which come under the Security Council's resolutions.

179. For these reasons, the Italian delegation would have been happy to associate itself with the majority of the General Assembly in voting in favour of the resolution on apartheid. I wish to seize this opportunity to express our appreciation to the co-sponsors of draft resolution A for their co-operation and efforts to make the original text of the draft more acceptable to our point of view.

180. Unfortunately, we find in the draft resolution, as adopted by the Special Political Committee, one paragraph, the sixth operative paragraph, which we are still unable to support. We feel that it would have been more correct and more in consonance with the spirit and letter of the Charter simply to draw the attention of the Security Council to the situation existing in South Africa, without attempting to define it or to suggest the applicability of Chapter VII and of the methods of sanctions. These decisions, in our view, come within the competence of the Security Council, as defined by Article 39 of the Charter.

181. Let me also say that we have serious doubts about the feasibility of universal economic sanctions against South Africa and of the effect of such measures, even if it were possible to enforce them. Nevertheless, if they are ever adopted by the Security Council, we shall certainly abide by them, as we have done in connexion with previous resolutions.

182. Therefore, if operative paragraph 6 is put to a separate vote, the Italian delegation will vote against it, and if the draft resolution as a whole is not amended, we cannot but abstain in the vote.

183. The Italian delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution B, providing for the establishment of a trust fund intended to alleviate the sufferings of the victims of apartheid, and we shall consider with the utmost sympathy the possibility of contributing to it.

184. Mr. PACHARIYANGKUN (Thailand): The opposition of the Thai Government to the policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa is quite clear and unequivocal. We in Thailand regard the policy of apartheid or any other form of racial discrimination as inhuman, immoral, and totally repugnant to all mankind.

185. We deplore and condemn the intransigent attitude and the stubborn behaviour of the South African Government in not heeding the numerous and repeated calls and appeals of the United Nations and of the overwhelming majority of the population. The Thai Government has consistently observed the United Nations resolutions on the question of apartheid, and my delegation therefore warmly welcomes the adoption by the Special Political Committee of draft resolution A [A/6159, para. 17].

186. We are grateful to the co-sponsors of the draft resolution for having made praiseworthy and constructive efforts in recommending further concrete measures which could well contribute to the early demise of the outrageous and obnoxious policies of apartheid.

187. My delegation fully endorses the proposal contained in operative paragraph 3 to enlarge the Special Committee on the Policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa by the addition of six members. We believe that the expansion will further strengthen the role and effectiveness of the Special Committee, which, as we all know, has been pursuing its work diligently and objectively.

188. In this connexion, the Thai delegation wishes to express its deepest appreciation to the Committee which, under the active Chairmanship of Mr. Achkar, the representative of Guinea, kept us fully informed of the developments of the situation in South Africa. Its well-documented report to the General Assembly, together with the important statements of Mr. Achkar, the Chairman, and Mr. Khatri, the representative of Nepal, the Committee's Rapporteur, have certainly been most helpful to the members of the Special Political Committee.

189. The Thai delegation welcomes the inclusion of operative paragraph 6 in the draft resolution, which draws the attention of the Security Council to the fact that the situation in South Africa constitutes a threat to international peace and security, that action under Chapter VII of the Charter is essential in order to solve the problem of apartheid and that universally applied economic sanctions are the only means of achieving a peaceful solution. We are aware that, in accordance with Article 39 of the Charter, the Security Council is the body to determine the existence of any threat to the peace. However, we feel that it is not improper for the General Assembly to shed further light on the matter and to request the Security Council, particularly those members that oppose such a view, to consider the question in a more enlightened and disinterested manner. It is essential for the Security Council to be cognizant of the views of the great majority of nations, and my delegation fervently hopes that the Security Council will not fail to take those views into account in its future deliberations on the question of the apartheid policy of South Africa.

190. On the basis of the views that I have just explained, the Thai delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A.

191. My delegation also shares strongly the noble sentiments which prompted the co-sponsors of draft resolution B to submit it for the consideration of the Special Committee. We applaud their positive endeavours to facilitate the extension of humanitarian assistance to the victims of the dastardly and inhuman policies of apartheid. The Thai delegation is happy to give its support to draft resolution B.

192. Mr. LICHTVELD (Netherlands): As I had occasion to state in the general debate in the Special Political Committee on 7 December, the Government and the people of all three component and autonomous parts of the Kingdom of the Netherlands reject the

policy of apartheid. We consider this policy as being contrary to our tradition of tolerance and individual freedom, contrary to the basic concepts of democracy, contrary to the principle accepted in our time of complete equality of all races, contrary to the principles of the United Nations and of human rights, contrary to the dignity of the non-white races, and ultimately even contrary to the long-range interests of the white inhabitants of South Africa.

193. The resolution as adopted in the Special Political Committee contained a number of paragraphs to which my delegation could subscribe because they reflected correctly our position, which I have just made clear. I have specifically in mind operative paragraphs 4 and 8. When a separate vote was taken on operative paragraphs 1, 7 and 10, we were obliged to abstain, however, and we have to vote against operative paragraph 6. My delegation abstained from voting on the draft resolution as a whole, and will do so now again.

194. This abstention should not be construed as some form of indifference with regard to operative paragraph 6. My Government's position on the practicability and efficiency of economic sanctions remains unchanged. This is also the case with respect to the reference in that paragraph to a possible threat to international peace and security which could entail action under Chapter VII of the Charter. My Government adheres to the view that only the Security Council can establish this fact, in accordance with Article 39, and decide on possible measures, once a threat to the peace has been established. The General Assembly should, in our view, refrain from adopting a paragraph which tries to establish a fact which only that organ is called upon to decide.

195. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We shall now vote on the two draft resolutions, A and B, submitted by the Special Political Committee [A/6159, para. 17]. The Secretary-General has provided a statement [A/C.5/1048] of the financial implications of the draft resolutions of that Committee. I would draw the attention of the Assembly to the fact that no new appropriations are required for the implementation of these draft resolutions.

196. I put draft resolution A to the vote. A roll-call vote has been asked for.

The vote was taken by roll-call.

Saudi Arabia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda.

Against: South Africa, Portugal.

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway.

*Draft resolution A was adopted by 80 votes to 2, with 16 abstentions.***

197. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I put draft resolution B to the vote.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 95 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

198. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): Under the terms of the two resolutions just adopted by the General Assembly, the President is requested to appoint six additional members of the Special Committee on the Policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa and to nominate five Member States, each of which will appoint a member of the committee of trustees. I shall announce the names of these members and these States within the next few days.

The meeting rose at 1.55 p.m.

**The representative of Madagascar subsequently informed the Secretariat that, if he had been present during the vote, he would have voted in favour of the draft resolution (see 1396th meeting, para. 61).